

With respect to the subject of blockades; the principle of the law of nations, as asserted by the U. States, is, that a blockade can only be justified when supported by an adequate force. In theory this principle is admitted by Great Britain. It is alledged, however, that in practice, she disregards that principle.

The order of blockade, which has been made a specific ground of complaint, by France, is that of the 16th of May 1806. Yet, strange as it may seem, this order, which is, now, made one ground of war between the two countries was, at the time of its first issuing, viewed as an act of favor and conciliation. On this subject it is necessary to be explicit. The vague and indeterminate manner, in which, the American and French governments, in their official papers, speak of this order of blockade, is calculated to mislead. An importance is attached to it, of which, in the opinion of the undersigned, it is not worthy. Let the facts speak for themselves.

In Aug. 1804, the British established a blockade at the entrance of the French ports, naming them, from Fecamp to Ostend; and from their proximity to the British coasts, and the absence of all complaint, we may be permitted to believe that it was a legal blockade, enforced according to the usages of nations. On the 16th of May, 1806, the English Secretary of State, Mr. Fox, notified to our Minister, at London, that his government had thought fit to direct necessary measures to be taken for the blockade of the coasts, rivers and ports, from the river Elbe to the river Brest, both inclusive.\*

In point of fact, as the terms used in the order will show, this paper, which has become, a substantive and avowed cause for non-intercourse, embargo and war, is a blockade, only of the places, on the French coast, from Ostend to the Seine, and even as to these it is, merely as it professes to be, a continuance of a former and existing blockade. For with respect to the residue of the coast, trade of neutrals is admitted, with the exception only, of enemy's property and articles contraband of war, which are liable to be taken, without a blockade; and except the direct colonial trade of the enemy, which Great Britain denied to be free by the law of nations. Why the order was thus extended, in its form, while in effect it added nothing to orders and regulations already existing, will be known by adverting to papers, which are before the world. In 1806, France, had yet colonies and the wound inflicted on our feelings, by the interference of the British government in our trade, with those colonies, had been the cause of remonstrance and negotiation. At the moment when the order of May 1806, was made, Mr. Monroe, the present Secretary of State, then our minister plenipotentiary at the Court of Great Britain, was in treaty on the subject of the carrying trade, and judging on the spot, and at the time, he, unhesitatingly, gave his opinion, that the order was made to favor American views and interests. This idea is unequivocally ex-

\* The terms of the order are these: That the said coast, rivers and ports must be considered as blockaded," but, "that such blockade shall not extend to prevent neutral ships and vessels, laden with goods, not being the property of his majesty's enemies, and not being contraband of war from approaching the said coasts and entering into and sailing from the said rivers and ports and except the coast, rivers and ports from Ostend to the river Seine, already in a state of strict and rigorous blockade; and which are to be considered as so continued," with a proviso, that the vessels entering had not been laden at a port belonging to, or in possession of, the enemies of Great Britain, and the vessels departing were not destined to an enemy port, or had previously broken blockade."

pressed, of May,

And  
retary of  
blockade

"ado of  
the Un

It appe

our trade  
his coun

blockade  
from Ost

and for  
complain

ince; th  
after the

was appr  
e taken

Of this

the admin  
bargo as i

peal of th  
during th

Erskine,

cerning  
the Uniter

both auth  
voke or

tral com  
on. And

was to ce  
quence of

was made  
November

remov  
was not in

was deem  
under the

ation of th  
on; an in

as directl

"he foll  
thus spe

to extend  
from many

the Seine, ex  
izable with

emy as c  
free in th

been the co  
dubted that  
if inten

On  
en strengt  
w to the c  
highly m